

Minutes to Network Advisory Board (NAB)
March 1-2, 2000

Attendance: Max Leek, Marshall Public Library; Paul Krause, Lewis-Clark State College, VALNet; Carolyn Mauer, Dept. of Education; Ann Joslin, ISL; Tom Olsen, Boise School District; Kay Flowers, ISU; Frank Nelson, ISL; Charlie Bolles, ISL; Karen Ganske, Nampa Public Library; Ruth Funabiki, U of I Law; Carol Silvers, ISL; Dawn Wittman, Lewiston City Library; Joe Reiss, Post Falls Public Library, CIN; Ron Force, UI; Janet Strong, BSU; Rand Simmons, ISL; Tim Brown BSU; Sue Walker, ISL (Wednesday).

Wednesday, March 1, 2000

Agenda Covered

LSTA

2000 Awards

List of projects that have been approved by the State Library Board was distributed. Brief descriptions of the networking projects were provided. There was a discussion about LSTA, that it was not adequate to fund all the applications this year, and that it may not be sufficient to fund a statewide network of libraries. It was noted that there is overlap between the work of the Network Advisory Board and the LSTA Advisory Board. Max and Paul serve on both.

LSTA Eligibility Requirements for Library Consortia

The State Library Board will consider amending eligibility requirements for Library Consortia. This will effect only library consortia. The revision would allow a consortium to be the recipient of grant funds. The consortia eligibility requirements assure that the consortium, is a legal organization that can receive and account for funds. This will greatly simplify the application process. Currently all entities in a consortium are required to submit an eligibility checklist which becomes quite cumbersome. This revision will pre-qualify consortia for grant applications.

Networking Plan

This year's round of LSTA grants had two large-sum applications from networks and several districting applications. All of these fall into the State Library's highest priorities. We no longer have a networking plan in Idaho. The prior plan expired in 1999. From Rand's viewpoint it would be helpful if the Network Advisory Board would develop a plan to share with Advisory Council as they make decisions about funding applications. The two boards are complementary. The Network Advisory Board can advise the Advisory Council regarding a plan for creating a statewide network of libraries and for networking in general. The plan would also advise consortia as to the direction the State Library is taking regarding networking issues.

NAB deemed this an important issue and asked that the agenda be adjusted to continue conversation on the next day.

LiLI Web Site

The NAB-LiLI Committee developed guidelines regarding the philosophy of redesigning the LiLI website. The LiLI website will serve as an extension or communication piece for the Network of Idaho Libraries/NAB. A Web Spinners redesign committee will meet next week. It will decide if we need to hire a professional web designer or if we can do it on our own. We have a contract with Omni Studios who developed the logo. They may be asked to redesign the logo. We used Omni Studios for the redesign of the State Library home page site.

LiLI Databases

Handouts distributed.

We had two requests from the Legislature about the use of the databases, one from Rep. Frances Field, and the other from our financial analyst, Jeff Shinn. List of all the resources available through the LiLI Databases. The usage data is now available on the LiLI web site.

It was noted that the schools are benefiting from all the databases not just the school databases. Academics are the heaviest users.

The databases are up for renewal at the end of 2000, but we have the right to renew for two more one-year periods. We don't have enough experience to accurately evaluate the databases this year. Rand is putting a survey together to determine customer satisfaction,

service, etc. The survey will be conducted yearly.

LiLI Z39.5 Gateway Project

Blue Angel provided a prototype which ITTF and NAB-Z evaluated. This is a test database. The results are rough. We are on target to have a satisfactory product by the end of the fiscal year.

E-Rate

Statistics were distributed.

Some states have made it a requirement that if libraries want to apply for LSTA funds they must have applied for E-Rate or explain why it didn't benefit them to do so. This would that be a good thing for Idaho to do.

Gates

Charlie and Ann attended a Gates Foundation meeting in Seattle. The overriding attitude seemed to be, "If this application is at all justifiable, let's fund it." There were 90 some applications. We had 8 public libraries that were eligible to apply who did not apply. To be eligible a library must serve at least 10% poverty based on a secret formula. Twenty libraries asked for Spanish language workstations.

No Idaho applications were denied. Gates is providing training to state library staff. This will provide an overview of the program. They will cover up to 8 people on the staff to go. If anyone is interested in assisting or being on call, especially in North Idaho, we will make you an honorary member of the LDD to participate in the Gates training, May 8 & 9 2000.

Brokering Data Bases

We have been requested to broker a statewide CINAHL database. ISL would negotiate a group purchase, but each library would be invoiced independently. There are no state dollars involved in funding the license. The State Library has statutory authority to purchase library services without working with the Division of Purchasing. We are in the process of drafting purchasing procedures for the State Library. The State Library Board will review the procedures in early April.

Thursday, March 2, 2000

GILS

Handout provided.

Carol Silvers presented her Government Information Locator Service project. This is an extension of ISL's current program of managing state government publications. Carol has approached the Department of Administration, but they are focused on e-commerce and not interested in GILS. Carol asked the NAB academic library directors about their interest. Kay Flowers said that she thought GILS fit in well with networking. Tim Brown said we should go ahead and participants for committees, from individual academic libraries, would be delegated.

Access may be the first issue; preservation may have to wait in the wings. Possible funding sources may be TOP (formerly TIAAP) grants and/or Leadership Grants from IMLS.

NAB-ILL Committee: Kay Flowers, Chair

Flip charts.

Kay presented the work of her committee from Wednesday morning.

A lively discussion pursued. The committee believes that a delivery system is critical. NAB decided that the academic libraries, because of their concern for distance learners, and the Idaho State Library will approach the State Board of Education to request setup of hubs in the academic locations. \$26,000 - \$30,000 would get LME Drops in seven locations in state. No staff funding is involved. We would get interstate delivery as well as outside state delivery. State Library staff will send an RFI to LME and ask for a written price quote. The State Library will talk with Nancy Szofran and Greg Fitch of SBOE.

Next steps for the committee is begin to define the statewide efforts. Keep the discussions going about the issues with the statewide library card. The Committee will create access models for the next NAB meeting, focusing primarily on interlibrary loan.

LiLI-Z, the Virtual Catalog, is an essential part of statewide access and policies will be developed via the NAB-Z Committee.

Review Futures Document

The futures document was presented. Discussion pursued are the following issues:

- continuous access and service to anyone, anywhere, anytime
- boundary-less organic network with uniform interface
- cutting edge technology
- gateway to the world

LSTA applicants are asked to address goals from the futures document. We have seen a marked change in applications. Applicants see the connection in what they are trying to do and the plan for the future

This futures document seems from the State Library's point of view to still be what we are aiming for. Access is the access to library resources 24 hours a day. This might include electronic access for 24 hr. per day reference. It could also include databases offered remotely. Most libraries are not offering remote access at this point. With the Z39 client gateway the success is going to depend on dedicated lines to 24 hr. access to Z39 servers.

Albertson money is a big step for schools. Libraries were included in the tech plans for the schools this year. If they were not included they were sent back.

We have a successful VALNet model. We need to provide administrators with information from VALNet that shows the services and advantages to joining a network. In general this information would be helpful to LDD as an example of the benefits you get from belonging to a network. The CIN-VALNet cooperative effort, funded by a 2000 LSTA grant, may provide a model for how the networks could coordinate with each other. Northwest Regional Education Lab may be a possible source for funding promotional materials for VALNet

Serving the Unserved Model

A theoretical model for serving the unserved was presented and discussed.

Examination of Networked Services

We have an action plan for the network advisory board that we will want to take a look at and update for the coming year. What we do not have is something to provide guidance to the local library community. Yesterday we went back and forth between Infrastructure and services. Using the services described in the document we could use this to discuss.

Infrastructure:

Governance

Organizational structure

Administration

Funding

Staffing

Other

Services:

LiLI Website

Statewide licenses

Virtual Catalog

Patron ILL

Delivery

Statewide Walk-In Access

Technical support - moved from infrastructure

Training/Education - as applied to network services

Acquisition and Cataloging

Circulation - services that the shared automated systems already provide in some parts of the state.

We will be looking for in the Infrastructure is plenty of flexibility so that the delivery method for the services can change rapidly and easily with technology and opportunity.

For each service, the Board answered the following questions:

- 1) Should this be a networked service?
- 2) From what level is this service best provided?
- 3) To what level is this best provided (audience)
- 4) What is the immediacy of attention needed? 1,3 or 5 years

LiLI Website

- 1) Yes
- 2) Provided at the state level
- 3) Audience is two fold: the citizens of Idaho and the Libraries of Idaho
- 4) Presently being done

This should be a high priority, on going

Full Text Electronic Resources

Not totally confined to LiLI Databases. Consider anything which requires a statewide license.

Present statewide license, then talk about other desirable things.

- 1) Yes
- 2) Provided at a state level (multi state cooperation should be considered or use of third party vendor such as BCR)
- 3) Provided to citizens of Idaho, legislation says publicly funded libraries.
- 4) Ongoing and a high priority

Brokering Group Purchases

State library has been asked to broker contracts for groups of libraries interested in specialty databases, e.g., CINAHL for academic and health sciences libraries. The State Library could coordinate the purchase, however we might not be able to sign the contract. We also can not collect the funds. Each library pays directly to the vendor. This is an area where we will need to stay flexible.

- 1) Yes
- 2) State coordinated – could be provided locally
- 3) Local, regional or state -- varies
- 4) Within 1 year

Virtual Catalog: Z39.50 Client Gateway

- 1) Yes
- 2) Search limited number of systems (consortia)
- 3) Audience: Access for library staff as first phase
- 4) Gateway by May 2000

Right now we are targeting shared automated systems and individual automated systems. The fewer systems that we try to search across, the better the results. The end user is the person doing the search. Do we want the Z39.50 gateway to search first at a regional level or a consortia level or do we want it to search at the consortia and individual library levels? Mechanics are an issue and are directly related to what the infrastructure is going to look like. There are LSTA implications, implications for building larger systems, and implications for ILL. The Z39.50 gateway, i.e., the Virtual Catalog, may be phased in over the next couple of years. The NAB-Z Committee is working on these issues.

We have some immediacy in implementing a gateway by the end of May so that we do not lose our funds.

Patron-initiated ILL: Remote ILL Unmediated

- 1) Yes
- 2) State (phased-in implementation)
- 3) Audience: independent patron/citizen. Independent libraries are involved in the process.
- 4) 3-5 years. Develop at library/network level first.

There has to be a uniform way to handle this and the State Library must be involved. There must be some sort of network infrastructure. The mechanism that would support this would be at the state level. Would a good use of LSTA fund be to develop this on a regional level?

Document Delivery (Courier)

- 1) Yes
- 2) State backbone of regional hubs; hubs serve local libraries
- 3) Provided to libraries (not individuals)
- 4) Immediate – 6 months

The state role would be coordination, contract negotiation, funding for the backbone, help in setting up sub-routes.

Action to be taken: Approach the State Board of Education for 2002 funding. Unless they had contingency funds available right now we would have to wait until at least 2002.

By then we would have the data from CIN/VALNet and EILNet delivery systems. This leaves the implementation 15 to 18 months out.

The State Library will talk with Nancy Szofran, Chief Technology Officer for the State Board of Education soon. The academic libraries might present this as a means of serving distant learners.

Statewide Walk-In Access

- 1) Yes – requires cooperation among libraries
- 2) State – centralized planning & coordination. Statewide cards may be issued locally.
- 3) Audience: Citizens through local libraries.
- 4) Achieve with in 3-5 years

Technical Support

Technical support of IT/network hardware & software.

- 1) Yes
- 2) Regional, within a day's drive
- 3) Audience: local library
- 4) 5+ years for statewide approach. Technical supports should be part of doing business. Must be part of planning for services.

Training and Education on Network Services

- 1) Yes – for statewide network services: Z39.50 gateway, patron-initiated interlibrary loan, etc. For patrons: patron-initiated interlibrary loan, how to choose a library to use, etc.
- 2) Level depends on service; statewide service done from state, regional level from region
- 3) Local library and citizens

- 4) As needed, coordinated with implementation of a service

*Assisting Libraries to Automate
Acquisitions/ Catalog/ Circulation*

- 1) Not a statewide network service – not doing, but assisting. NAB supports this activity.
Every library must have MARC records.
- 2) From state or regional network area
- 3) To local libraries
- 4) Ongoing

BIN ITEM: Setting guidelines and standards might be a function of a statewide network.

Communication

Essential. Ongoing. The topic is worth leaving as a reminder to us that it is important to keep communicating. On-going.

Networking Plan

We should bring the plan out and review it at every meeting. It might be nice to have a status report on the web.

Updates

NAB-Z

Z39.50 gateway will be running by late May, early June. The phase in has not been determined. Max Leek suggested that the NAB-Z Committee meet by conference call to get some of the items completed.

Technology and Policy Requirements - Not addressed yet in committee

Marketing Plan – Has not been addressed

User Satisfaction Survey for LiLI-D - Has not been designed

Recommendations for training and education may be added to Committee's responsibilities.

LiLI Web Site

LiLI Web Site Redesign. In progress. A Web Spinners design committee is working now. It is very likely that the redesign may be completed by July 1.

LiLI Database Project

Working with vendors to find means for local libraries to pull their own usage data. It is cumbersome to get usage information right now. Working to get better statistics by July 1.

The two year contract is up at the end of this year, 2000. We will wait until the third of forth year to renegotiate. It is certain that we are going to go at least three years before renewal. A user satisfaction survey is due to be administered Fall 2000.

ILL Reciprocal Borrowing/Statewide Library Card

The NAB-ILL Committee plans to have one or two models by July 1

If we get a positive answer from the State Board of Education regarding document delivery, we will need some NAB members to finalize the hub system. This is probably a 2001 project, but will not happen before July 1.

Governments and Finance

Funding for the backbone of document delivery was identified as a need for SFY2002 budget. Future funding need will include additional State Library personnel to staff the statewide network

Action Plan Update

A committee will be formed to work on an easy, marketable plan. Move to 2001 activities.

Decisions will have been made for funding for staff position. State Library Board has not been approached about this. As far as this board is concerned, this has been accomplished.

Identification of a statewide network name. No progress. Move to 2001 activities.

Process in place for ISL to deal with brokering group purchases. We are working on this. We plan to take something to the state library board July 1.

Listserv for NAB has been accomplished.

We need a committee to deal with document delivery - at least to deal with the form of documents that already exist. NAB-ILL will take responsibility.

Once the minutes are recorded we may have some suggestions for what might be placed in 2001 plan.

How we work

The networking budget was presented and discussed. Options considered were email, chat rooms, video conferencing, better use of the listserv. For the time being we will use e-mail to inform the NAB and its committees.

Networking Plan

ISL will have a draft of the Network Plan available for the next meeting. This will be very basic and will feed into the LSTA Allocation Plan.

Next Meeting

July and August are absolutely out. Set for June 6 & 7, 2000, a Tuesday and Wednesday.

Next Steps

ISL will have something of an action plan for the next meeting

ISL, we will talk to the State Board of Education about funding for the document delivery hubs

The Z39.50 gateway should be functioning

ISL will prepare a Network Plan draft for the next meeting

Committees will prepare reports for next meeting

NAB-ILL will have two models put together.

ISL will get an LME estimate on the cost of developing a backbone of hubs

Meeting Evaluation

Now that we have met twice, what works and what does not work?

Hall of Mirrors is preferable to working in the Large Conference Room.

The flexibility of the agenda was appreciated

Getting packets off the web worked well

ISL reporting on what has been accomplished so far and what needs to be planned was straight forward. Good balance between discussion and presentation of information.

Interspersing discussion with information (less information presented at one time) is

desirable.

Travel and lodging arrangements were satisfactory

Meeting adjourned.